DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 811 CS 504 198

AUTHOR Prentice, Diana B.
TITLE Analysis in Lincoln-Douglas Debate.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Lincoln, NE, April 7-9, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Debate; Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; Persuasive Discourse; *Policy; Speech Communication; *Teaching Methods; *Values; *Values Education
IDENTIFIERS *Lincoln Douglas Debate Style

ABSTRACT

Lincoln-Douglas style debate will not reach its objectives as value-oriented argumentation until debaters are trained in values analysis. Lacking adequate theoretical and practical literature and unsure of this relatively new debate format, coaches and debaters fail to develop an adequate understanding of what a value is and how it relates to policy decisions. To help solve these problems, values analysis in Lincoln-Douglas debate should take place on three levels: (1) the nature of values and their effect on decision making, (2) the values inherent within a given topic, and (3) the conflict between opposing values presented in a debate. Debaters are often unfamiliar with values language, unaware of how values operate in our personal lives and in public decision making, and uncertain of how values and policy interact. Brainstorming and seeking out values language while researching the topic can help students seek out the values in a given topic. Argument analysis can be used to compare and contrast values positions. (An appendix outlines lectures and projects for teaching analysis and provides a resource list of books and articles.) (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED229811

ANALYSIS IN

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

Diana B. Prentice
Washburn University
Topeka, Kansas 66621

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diana B. Prentice

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented to
Central States Speech Association
Lincoln, Nebraska
April 9, 1983

CS584198

Because Lincoln-Douglas debate is a relatively new competitive activity, little is written on its theory and practice.[1] What literature is available, however, suggests that Lincoln-Douglas focuses on values issues. This direction for values topics was established when the National Forensic League added Lincoln-Douglas as a national event in 1979. The Executive Secretary said that "the statement of the topic is a resolution of value rather than policy."[2] Unfortunately, those of us who judge Lincoln-Douglas debate often find that despite the stated goals of L-D as non-policy debate, values often are obscured and policy issues and language are prevalent in arguments. Some suggest that blame rests with poorly structured topics which emphasize policy issues more than values.[3] While topics may be partially to blame for the inability of debaters to focus on values, the causes do not stop there. As with cross-ex debate, the type and quality of arguments are largely a result of the analysis which precedes the debate round. If Lincoln-Douglas topic analysis does not focus on values, the resultant issues and arguments will not.

After working with Lincoln-Douglas debaters in both classroom and workshop settings, this author has reached the conclusion that L-D debate will not reach its objectives as value-oriented argumentation until debaters are trained in values analysis. Thus, this paper suggests a method of approaching values topic analysis. Specifically, the paper presents a theory as to why students have difficulty with L-D analysis, and then presents a method for teaching analysis strategies. Additionally, an appendix provides examples of classroom activities and workshop programs designed to teach values analysis.

The Problems of Values Analysis

A Lincoln-Douglas debater in the final round of a tournament debating the topic "That protection of the environment should take precedence over development of natural resources," announced that he was defending the following values: (1) Objectives should be prioritized (2) Industry should not take precedence, and (3) The environment has been damaged. Anyone familiar with values and values language would be hard-pressed to find the actual values this student was defending. "Values" positions similar to those listed above have been heard in many rounds, however. Because policy statements are often referred to as the "values" the debater is defending, one is left to ask why this type of labeling occurs. As noted previously, blame can be placed on topics such as the environment topic which are worded as comparisons of policies. This, however, does not explain the occurrence fully since the original Lincoln-Douglas debates were over a policy but had arguments rooted in values. Rieke and Sillars state that "there is no such thing as a valueless statement;"[4] therefore, values analysis should not be affected by the statement of the topic. Furthermore, the statements made by the debater in the example do have values implications, but they are obscured by the language of the statements. The problem, then, with L-D analysis is not necessarily with the topics but with the students' lack of understanding as to what values are and how they relate to policies.

For a variety of reasons, education, in general, and competitive debate, in particular, have overlooked the societal values which affect our history, behavior, and policies. In fact, in recent years values education has been the target of criticism, and teachers tread lightly in the area. Insofar as L-D debate is concerned, values are being

confronted, but indirectly as a result of two factors. First, Lincoln-Douglas coaches and debaters suffer from a dearth of specific literature to explain values debate and analysis within the Lincoln-Douglas format.[5] The activity is in its infancy, and it will take time to develop a body of literature that is both defined by the practices and influences practice. While more and more literature is surfacing, it is often inaccessible to many practitioners because it is in the form of convention papers or state journal articles. Often the material is theoretical in nature and considers what Lincoln-Douglas debate is and is not. While this type of research is needed, the pedagogical aspects of L-D should also be considered. Essentially, our rush to develop a competitive analysis of values issues has overlooked the need to address the prerequisite skills debaters need to participate in the activity. Chief among these is an understanding of what a value is and how it related to policy decisions. It is the relationship between the existence of values and the mechanics of L-D debate that debaters must understand before participating in the event.

The second problem is that coaches and judges are still searching for the meaning and the means of Lincoln-Douglas debate. This often leads to deficiencies in coaching and judging strategies which prevent development of prerequisite analytic skills or an understanding of why values are obscured. The next section of this paper suggests analysis strategies suitable for topic and argument analysis.

An Approach to Values Analysis

Values analysis in Lincoln-Douglas debate should take place on three levels: (1) the nature of values and their effect on decision making, (2) the values inherent within a given topic, and (3) the conflict

between opposing values presented in a debate. The first two levels precede composition of arguments and actual competition; the third occurs during a round. The processes of each level of analysis are discussed below.

Nature of Values

One of the reasons why values are obscured in Lincoln-Douglas is that debaters are not familiar with values language. Few cross-exam coaches would send students off to debate without first introducing them to the jargon of debate--inherency, topicality, significance, disadvantages, etc. Because values are at the heart of Lincoln-Douglas debate, debaters should first be familiar with the language of values--values terms, values hierarchies, and values conflicts. In order to know what values influence a policy or are the basis for a particular topic, debaters must know what words describe the values. Words such as freedom, rights, life, equality, or opportunity should be familiar to debaters as values terms. And in order to be familiar with the words that label values, debaters should read or be introduced to the classic literature in values such as the works of Milton Rokeach.

Once debaters are familiar with values terms, they then need to be aware of how values operate in our personal lives and in public policy decision making. They need to know that we hold multiple values, all of which cannot be achieved simultaneously. Debaters need to understand the concept of values hierarchies as the means by which values are prioritized because they cannot be achieved equally and simultaneously in most instances. Finally, debaters need to be aware that debate exists when values conflict and that at the heart of all policy debates are values

which are either preserved, destroyed, or sublimated to other values by a given policy. Without this type of understanding, Lincoln-Douglas will continue to be an effort to determine how cross-exam stock issues apply to Lincoln-Douglas or whether or not topicality is an issue. Debaters should begin to view the "stock issues" of L-D as values hierarchies, conflicts, and the relationship of values to policies. In other words, values analysis needs a framework quite different from policy analysis and that framework is grounded in the nature of values themselves.

Fortunately for Lincoln-Douglas debaters, argumentation literature does address the relationship of values to policies, and Lincoln-Douglas debaters would be well-advised in their early stages of learning the activity to read not only the works of values theorists, but also those of argumentation theorists. Books which provide excellent insight into the values "stock issues" discussed above are Patterson and Zarefsky's Contempory Debate, Rieke and Sillar's Argumentation and the Decision Making Process, and Ziegelmueller and Dause's Argumentation, Inquiry and Advocacy.

Topic Analysis

Once debaters know what the term "values" means and are acquainted with values language, they are equipped to seek out the values in a given topic. Often the values are not contained in the wording of the topic; thus, debaters must look for the reasons why the two positions suggested by the topic exist. In other words, what values motivate us to protect the environment, and what values motivate us to develop natural resources?

There are two methods which can enable debaters to identify the values implicit within a resolution. The first is brainstorming with

other debaters, and the second is seeking out values language while researching the topic. An excellent system for identifying values is through a dialectic process. The outlines in the appendix suggest how to incorporate dialectic into the analysis process. In the course of reading on the topic, debaters should look for values terms and determine what values affect the policies implied by Lincoln-Douglas topics.

By seeking out the values language of a topic through dialectic and research, debaters are better prepared to develop cases and arguments which utilize values terms and show relationships between values and policies. Case construction then becomes a means of identifying clearly the values represented by the debater's position and why those values are desirable. Step one establishes the values defended, and step two provides the rationale or contentions for the case. Debaters in L-D must be prepared both to identify the values conflicts in a round and to defend their hierarchies. The focus of the debate should be on the defense of the hierarchies. The rationale statements or contentions must relate to the values first and to an implied policy second.

Argument Analysis

Within the course of the debate, values positions should be compared and contrasted. Debaters need to explain the differing values in terms of hierarchies and conflicts using their rationale statements to suggest why one set of values should take precedence over the other. It is at this point that factual evidence, policy implications, and even plans become a means of illustrating the effects of preferring one set of values over another.

If one of the debaters in the round does not articulate clearly the values defended, cross-exam questions should uncover the values. Debaters also need to be aware at the argumentation stage that both debaters may support the same values, but can disagree as to the best means of securing the values. Thus, topics which appear to be purely policy statements can be examined within a values framework if debaters first state the values represented by the topic, why those values are important, and how a particular policy either preserves or jeopardizes a value.

Conclusion

Values debate has potential to be an exciting form of argument, and with each year that Lincoln-Douglas debate exists, its potential will come closer to being realized. However, one of the advantages of Lincoln-Douglas debate--teaching students about the relationship of values to policies--will not be realized without first helping students gain an understanding of values themselves. The approach to Lincoln-Douglas analysis outlined in this paper focuses on values as a sort of stock issue in Lincoln-Douglas debate analysis. It is hoped that this approach to analysis will increase the emphasis on values and values language in L-D debate. The appendix which follows presents an outline of the content of lectures and projects appropriate for teaching analysis as well as a resource list of books and articles for coaches and students to read.

NOTES

[1]The primary resource for Lincoln-Douglas debaters is Fryar and Thomas' Student Congress and Lincoln-Douglas Debate (Skokie, Ill.: NTC, 1981). The University of Kansas Division of Continuing Education has published a collection of articles entitled Lincoln-Douglas Debate: Theory and Practice. Most other information is in the form of convention papers.

[2]Dennis Winfield, "From the Executive Secretary," The Rostrum, December, 1979, p. 2.

[3]Richard B. Sodikow, "Constructing the Lincoln-Douglas Debate Resolution," in Tom Pollard and Diana B. Prentice, eds., Lincoln-Douglas Debate: Theory and Practice (Lawrence, Ks.: University of Kansas, 1981), pp. 25-28.

[4]Richard D. Rieke and Malcolm O. Sillars, Argumentation and the Decision-Making Process (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975), p. 116.

[5]See the list of sources at the end of this paper for a list of articles which deal with values debate in a more general sense.

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS WORKSHOP
Organized by
Frank Sferra and Diana Prentice

In September 1981 and 1982 Mullen High School, Denver, Colorado, hosted a one-day Lincoln-Douglas workshop which was organized around dialectic sessions as a means of analyzing the values conflicts inherent in a topic. The handouts included in this packet represent the materials and schedule used for the workshop.

Schedule of the day (1981 Session)

8:30-10:00 Facilitators meet with Diana and Frank
(We will ask several coaches to serve as facilitators. Some schools may wish to involve advanced students in this role. It is a valuable learning experience)

Registration (Cafeteria)

10:00-11:00 An introduction to values and values hierarchies (lecture)

11:00-11:10 Break

11:10-12:00 An introduction to the dialectic process as a means of analyzing propositions of value (lecture)

12:00-1:00 Lunch (brown bag)

1:00-2:20 First dialectic session. Meet in small groups with facilitators. (Discuss the values in the brief)

2:20-2:30 Break

2:30-3:15 Decisions on the briefs and defense of positions (The briefs ask for students to serve as a Supreme Court or decision-making body. They are to vote on the issues and defend it in terms of the values they are defending)

3:15-3:20 Quick break

3:20-4:30 Analysis of the Colorado Lincoln-Douglas topic--DIALECTIC ONLY. At the conclusion of the dialectic each student will have prepared a summary of the values hierarchies and conflicts on each side of the issue.

Suggestions for Facilitators

The purpose of the dialectic is to have students focus on values conflicts and to have them become comfortable with value terms. By using a discussion technique, a variety of opinions is given in a short period of time. The time restraints do require somewhat rigid guidelines for discussion leaders. The following suggestions for organizing the groups are not meant to be prescriptive but are intended to offer a framework for focusing on values.

First dialectic session

Purpose: At the end of the session, each student will be able to identify the values hierarchies implicit in each side of the case.

Possible methods for structuring the discussion:

Step 1: Using either a round robin or a voluntary system, students identify and list the values present in the case. These can be presented as either individual values or as conflicting pairs. Get students to use the values terms presented in the morning lecture. Continue this phase of the discussion until students are satisfied that all values have been identified. (have students take notes)

Step 2: Have students suggest the most important value in the case. Encourage other students to challenge the choices or play devil's advocate yourself. Refer to the facts in the case or to other common knowledge areas related to the case as a manner of teaching students to integrate facts as a way of supporting the values. Values can be presented randomly or can alternate between values supporting each side.

Step 3: Have each student list and present a values hierarchy for each side.

Second dialectic session

Purpose: To have the groups vote on the cases and defend individual positions through the use of the values hierarchy.

Step 1: Have each student present a 2-3 minute position statement on the case with a values hierarchy to defend the position.

Step 2: Have students ask questions about the decisions given by others. Students should be forced to defend their hierarchies.

Step 3: Take a final vote on the case.

(I use a technique in which people voting in a similar manner sit together after Step 1. During Step 2 they may move if persuaded to vote the other way)

Third dialectic session

Purpose: This session will focus on the Colorado L-D topic. At the conclusion of the session students will have identified the values hierarchies implicit in each side of the resolution. A process similar to that in the first session should be followed.
REMEMBER, the facilitator's role is to keep discussion focused on values--center on <u>why</u> a position is more desirable rather than <u>what</u> the position is.

Outline of Lecture I

The Nature of Values

I. WHAT ARE VALUES?

A. Definition

B. Relationship of Values to Facts and Policies

C. Classification systems

1. General categories

a. Artistic

b. Moral

c. Political

d. Utilitarian

2. Terminal vs. Instrumental (Rokeach)

3. Core values vs. Subordinate values

II. THE PROCESS OF ACQUIRING VALUES

A. Free choice

B. Chosen from alternatives

C. Consequences or alternatives are weighed

D. Values are prized or cherished

E. Values are shared and publicly affirmed

F. Values are acted upon

G. Values are acted upon repeatedly and consistently

III. CHARACTERIZATION OF AMERICAN VALUES

A. Values are commonly shared by a majority of the society

B. Values do not exist independently of one another

C. There are no correct values

D. Values form the basis for decision making

E. Values change over time

Outline of Lecture 2

Using a Dialectic Process
To Analyze Lincoln-Douglas Topics

I. ANALYSIS PROBLEMS CONFRONTING LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATERS

A. Little theory available

B. Stock issues do not apply

C. Values are abstract

II. THE VALUE OF DISCUSSION ANALYSIS OF TOPICS

A. Allows for multiple viewpoints to be explored

B. Provides an organized framework for analysis

C. Allows for an integration of values with facts

III. THE DIALECTIC PROCESS

A. Definition of dialectic

B. Purposes of dialectic

C. Principles of dialectic

D. How to adapt dialectic to Lincoln-Douglas analysis

IV. STRUCTURE OF AFTERNOON SESSIONS

A. The case studies

B. Organization of the first session (incorporation of the dialectic process)

C. Organization of the second session (decision on the case study)

D. Organization of the third session (analysis of the Colorado topic)

Sample Brief for Dialectic 1

Problem Five: Nuclear War--First Strike

Throughout September, international tensions have been rising dangerously high. On September 26, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Sellud, comes to the President with startling news: he is absolutely certain that the Soviet Union is preparing to launch a nuclear attack on the United States. He claims that there can be no doubt. However, there is still limited time to act. For the Soviets to completely arm their warheads and evacuate their major population centers requires three days; two and one-half days remain. The arms race has escalated to the point where the Soviets can completely destroy this country, turning it into a radioactive wasteland if they launch. On the other hand, U.S. missiles are already armed and can be launched on half an hour's notice. Thus, if the President does decide to launch before the two and one-half days are up, the Soviets will have been destroyed with no damage done to the U.S.

The President calls you, his National Advisory Committee for Security Affairs, to a meeting and describes the situation. He will do whatever your Committee decides he should do. Secretary of State Larson informs the Committee that there is not hope of a diplomatic solution. However, he further argues that a nation committed to humanitarian values should not violate its own principles by brutally destroying a people. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff points out that it is necessary for national survival to take such action, and points out that we do not dare risk a miscalculation. If we are even fifteen minutes off, the destruction of this country could result. It is your decision.

How do you decide?

What values is each side supporting?

Why do those values come into conflict?

Why is one set of values preferable over the other?

(Brief courtesy of Erwin Chemerinsky, Northwestern University National High School Institute in Speech)

CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

In L-D Analysis

Day 1 - Basics of L-D Debate (lecture)

Day 2 - Values lecture

Day 3 - Dialectic lecture

Day 4 - Assignment for students:

You will discuss a case study in groups. At the end of 30 minutes you are to take a vote on the case study. You are also, prior to the vote, to prepare in writing, a list of two values that you think are of priority to each side in the discussion regardless of the position you take.

Day 5 - Assignment for students:

Look at the Lincoln-Douglas topic and begin a discussion of that topic. At the end of the discussion, you are to write a values hierarchy that could be defended by the affirmative in a L-D debate.

Day 6 - Continue analysis of the L-D topic. Determine what areas need research.

Day 7 - Assignment for students:

Prepare a six-minute first affirmative constructive speech on the L-D topic. The speech should include the following:

An introduction which includes a statement of the topic.

Identification of the values hierarchy that you are defending.

At least two contentions explaining why this values hierarchy is superior to any offered by the negative.

Day 8 - Assignment for students:

Prepare a three minute negative analysis speech. Follow a similar format to that used for the affirmative speech.

Day 9 - Begin debates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lincoln-Douglas and Values Debate

Angle, Paul M. Created Equal? The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Casteel, Doyle and Robert J. Stahl. Value Clarification in the Classroom: A Primer. Pacific Palisades, CA.: Goodyear Pub., Inc., 1975.

Dennis, Frank L. The Lincoln-Douglas Debates. New York: Mason & Lipscomb, 1974.

Dobkin, Milton. "Social Values and Public Address: Some Implications for Pedagogy." Western Speech Journal, 26 (1962), 140-45.

Flaningam, Carl D. "Value-Centered Argument and the Development of Decision Rules." Journal of the American Forensic Association, 19 (1982), 107-114.

Fryar, Maridell and David A. Thomas. Student Congress and Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1981.

Hample, Dale. "Testing a Model of Value Argument and Evidence." Communication Monographs, 44 (1977), 106-20.

Hensley, Dana, and Diana Prentice. Mastering Competitive Debate, 2nd ed. Caldwell: Clark, 1982, Appendix D.

Hunt, Everett Lee, "Dialectic--A Neglected Method of Argument." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 7 (1921), 221-232.

Matlon, Ronald J. "Debating Propositions of Value." Journal of the American Forensic Association, 14 (1978), 194-204.

- - - - - - - - "Propositions of Value: An Inquiry into Issue Analysis and the Laws of Presumption." In Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation. Ed. George Ziegelmueller and Jack Rhodes. American Forensic Association and SCA, 1981, pp. 494-512.

Miller, Gerald R. "Questions of Fact and Value: Another Look." Southern Speech Journal, 28 (1962), 116-22.

Patterson, J.W. and David Zarefsky. Contemporary Debate. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1983.

Pollard, Tom and Diana Prentice, eds. Lincoln-Douglas Debate: Theory and Practice. Lawrence, Ks.: Division of Continuing Education, 1981.

Rieke, Richard D. and Malcolm O. Sillars. Argumentation and the Decision Making Process. New York: John Wiley, 1975.

Ross, Mary D. A Coaches' Guide to Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri, 1981.

Sillars, Malcolm O. "Audience, Social Values, and the Analysis of Argument." The Speech Teacher, 22 (1973), 291-303.

Spillman, Bonnie. "The Impact of Value and Self-Esteem Messages in Persuasion." Central States Speech Journal, 50 (1979), 67-74.

Steele, Edward. "Social Values, the Enthymene, and Speech Criticism." Western Speech Journal, 26 (1962), 70-75.

Thomas, David A. "Lincoln-Douglas Debate" National Federation of State High School Associations, 1981. (Includes a tape and handout)

Thomas, David A., and Maridell Fryar. "Value Resolutions, Presumption, and Stock Issues." In Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation. Ed. George Ziegelmueller and Jack Rhodes. American Forensics Association and SCA, 1981, pp. 513-31.

Warnick, Barbara. "Arguing Value Propositions." Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18 (1981), 109-119.

Wenzel, Joseph W. "Toward a Rationale for Value-Centered Argument." Journal of the American Forensic Association, 13 (1977), 150-58.

Wenzel, Joseph W., and Dale J. Hample. "Categories and Dimensions of Value Propositions: Exploratory Studies." Journal of the American Forensic Association, 11 (1975), 121-31.

Young, Marilyn. "The Use of Evidence in Value Argument: A Suggestion." In Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation. Ed. Jack Rhodes and Sara Newell. Speech Communication Association and American Forensic Association, 1980, pp. 287-95.

Ziegelmueller, George, and Charles A. Dause. Argumentation, Inquiry and Advocacy. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Dialectic

Sattler, William M. "Socratic Dialectic and Modern Group Discussion." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 29 (1943), 152-157.

Values

Albert, Ethel M. "Conflict and Change in American Values: A Cultural-Historical Approach." Ethics, 74 (Oct. 1963), 19-33.

Arrow, Kenneth J. Social Choice and Individual Values. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

Bradner, Lowell, and Joan Sistrunk. "The Newspaper: Molder or Mirror of Community Values." Journalism Quarterly, 43 (1966), 497-504.

Castell, J. Doyle, and Robert J. Stahl. Value Clarification in the Classroom: A Primer. Santa Monica: Goodyear, 1975.

Chaffee, Steven H. "Salience and Pertinence as Sources of Value Change." Journal of Communication, 17 (1967), 25-38.

Inlow, Gart M. Values in Transition: A Handbook. New York: John Wiley, 1972.

Kluckholn, Clyde. "The Evolution of Contemporary American Values." Daedalus, 87, (1958), 78-109.

Krippendorff, Klaus. "The Expression of Value in Political Documents." Journalism Quarterly, 47 (1970), 510-18.

Lepley, Ray. The Language of Values. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

McEdwards, Mar, G. "American Values: Circa 1920-1970." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 57 (1971), 173-80.

Morison, Elting E., ed. The American Style: Essays in Value and Performance. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Morris, Charles. "Values, Problematic and Unproblematic, and Science." Journal of Communication, 11 (1961), 205-210.

Nelson, Jack L. Values in Society. Rochelle Park: Hayden, 1975.

Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Rous, Gerald L., and Dorothy E. Lee. "Freedom and Quality: Two Values of Political Orientation," Journal of Communication, 28 (1978), 45-51.

Simon, Sidney, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirshenbaum. Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategy for Teachers and Students. New York: Hart, 1972.

Steele, Edward D., and W. Charles Redding. "The American Value System: Premises for Persuasion." Western Speech Journal, 26 (1962), 83-91.

Stevenson, Charles L. Facts and Values: Studies in Ethical Analysis. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Van Mering, Otto. A Grammar of Human Values. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961.